

Date: Tue, 11 May 93 06:59:08 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #566
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 11 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 566

Today's Topics:

ARRL BULLETIN 53 ARLB053
 Cell Phone Scanners
Charger time for Alinco DJ-580T
 Cuba and QSLs
How's a Honda Accord w/50W VHF?
 Info-Hams Digest V93 #563
 no-code defense (2 msgs)
 test msg
 TS-850 General Coverage TX
what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 11 May 93 07:20:51 GMT
From: wupost!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!mstar!n8emr!bulletin@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: ARRL BULLETIN 53 ARLB053
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

=====
| Automatic relayed from packet radio via |
| N8EMR's Ham BBS, 614-895-2553 |
=====

ZCZC AG94
QST DE W1AW
ARRL BULLETIN 53 ARLB053

FROM ARRL HEADQUARTERS
NEWINGTON CT MAY 10, 1993
TO ALL RADIO AMATEURS

ON MAY 7 JOINT RESOLUTION S.J. 90 WAS INTRODUCED IN THE U.S. SENATE BY SEN. CHARLES ROBB OF VIRGINIA. IT'S A BILL RECOGNIZING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF RADIO AMATEURS.

ROBB, SAYING THAT WORDS WITHOUT DEEDS ARE EMPTY, WENT FURTHER. THE RESOLUTION, SUPPORTING AMATEURS ''AS NATIONAL POLICY,'' URGES ''ADOPTION OF RULES AND REGULATIONS THAT ENCOURAGE THE USE OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES WITHIN THE AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE.''

IT ALSO ''URGES THAT ANY REGULATIONS WHICH ARE NECESSARY AT ANY LEVEL OF GOVERNMENT BE CRAFTED IN WAYS THAT FACILITATE AND ENCOURAGE AMATEUR RADIO OPERATION AS A PUBLIC BENEFIT ... WITHOUT LIMITING THE DECISION-MAKING CAPABILITY OF ANY AGENCY -- LOCAL, STATE OR FEDERAL.

ROBB WAS JOINED IN INTRODUCING THE RESOLUTION BY SENATORS AKAKA OF HAWAII, DECONCINI OF ARIZONA, PRESSLER OF SOUTH DAKOTA, AND SHELBY OF ALABAMA.

ROBB NOTED AMATEURS' DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVICE DURING COMMUNICATIONS EMERGENCIES, THEIR ''EXPERTISE'' AS ''TECHNICAL INNOVATORS,'' AND THEIR DEVELOPMENT OF ''PRACTICAL AND AFFORDABLE ALTERNATIVES TO COMPLICATED EXPENSIVE NEW EQUIPMENT FROM THE LABORATORIES.''

THE RESOLUTION ALSO CITES AMATEURS' PIONEERING WORK IN SATELLITE COMMUNICATIONS AND ''LOW-COST, PRACTICAL DATA TRANSMISSION BY RADIO.''

THE RESOLUTION URGES THE FCC TO ADOPT RULES AND REGULATIONS TO ''ENCOURAGE THE USE OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES WITHIN THE AMATEUR RADIO SERVICE,'' AND SAYS ''REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION SHOULD BE MADE FOR THE EFFECTIVE OPERATION OF AMATEUR RADIO FROM RESIDENCES, PRIVATE VEHICLES AND PUBLIC AREAS, AND THAT REGULATION AT ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT SHOULD FACILITATE AND ENCOURAGE AMATEUR RADIO OPERATION AS A PUBLIC BENEFIT.''

NNNN

Date: Tue, 11 May 93 00:30:31 PDT
From: news.cerf.net!crash!slic!mikey@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Cell Phone Scanners
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Cecil_A_Moore@ccm.hf.INTel.COM (Cecil A Moore) writes:

>
> Harold, most cell phones use synthesizers with a serial bus tied into
> a microcontroller. The synthesizers have "magic" numbers just
> like all other synthesized radios. Take apart the cell phone, replace
> the uC with a properly programmed uC and bingo, you have a cell phone
> scanner for base stations. With a little more complexity, you can auto-
> matically switch cell sites along with the mobile cell phone in the car
> next to you. But 99.9% of the stuff on cell phones is not worth the time it
> takes to listen. It would take me a couple of days to design a cell phone
> scanner from scratch. I don't do it, not because I would be treading on
> legal thin ice, but it's just not worth the effort. Besides that, my
> Alinco DR-570 and DJ-580 will both scan the cell phone frequencies.
> All the information you ever need on AMPS cellular phones is contained
> in EIA/TIA-553... Cecil... KG7BK

This makes sense but I'd like to find any of the secret stuff
inside my ole Novatel. I have the programming unlock code and a
list of all the "dealer" codes, but have wondered if there was
more and how to get to it.

Not maybe worth the time to wobble the uC, but fasinating to me
none-the-less. I'm looking for more stuff to do with the phone
than to watch the signal-strength meter, if you get my drift.
Listening in to other conversations beyond having the "ability"
to do it, is not of prime importance.

--

Mike, San Diego, CA USA PGP V2.1 Public Key Available
mikey@slic.cts.com GENie: SLIC Ham: WB6WUI

Date: 11 May 93 06:00:39 GMT
From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Charger time for Alinco DJ-580T
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <DZJo3B1w165w@angus.mi.org> chris@angus.mi.org writes:
>Hi. I just purchased a 12v 800ma ni-cad for my Alinco DJ-580T ht. I'm not
>sure of the model number of the charger but it's the standard one which
>came with my radio. The manual (yes I did read it) suggests 14 hours for
>the 7.2v battery. Any nice person have the bigger battery? Thanks.

Noting that the charger that came with my DJ-180T (I believe it's the
2-meter-only version of the same rig) says it puts out 8.7V @ 70 ma, and
14.xV @ 70 mA, and knowing they have the same amp-hour capacity, I'd

venture the guess that 14 hours is just right for the higher-voltage battery as well. (If you notice, the contacts on the HV battery will be configured differently than for the LV battery, suggesting it will, of course, use the higher-voltage output of the charger.

Or, better yet, if you can afford it buy the better charger and only use the stock trickle charger occasionally. :-)

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|  WA9PDM      |      Use whichever one works                               |
+-----+
```

Date: 11 May 93 12:36:27 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Cuba and QSLs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

> It's no secret that the US and Cuba aren't the best of friends, but
> I have met a number of Cubans on the air, who have told me to QSL
> direct. Does anybody here have any experience (good or bad) with
> getting QSL cards from Cuba?

> As far as return postage, what do you do? Throw in a buck?
> I think not. I guess an IRC would work, but can anyone advise?

I've tried a couple of times to QSL direct using a green stamp and have had no success. My Cuba card was obtained through a Columbian QSL manager.

Good luck and 73,
Scott

--

Scott Ginsburg Voice: 508-436-3836
Wellfleet Communications Internet: ginsburg@wellfleet.com
2 Federal St. Amateur Radio: WA2CJT
Billerica, MA 01821 Packet: wa2cjt@n0ary.#nocal.ca.usa.na

Date: 11 May 93 12:50:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: How's a Honda Accord w/50W VHF?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I installed an Alinco DR599T dual-bander (50 watts on VHF/UHF) in my wife's 92 Accord. Works like a champ, with no difficulties. Antenna is mounted on the trunk, radio control head on the transmission hump.

I received the "Honda Package" from ARRL before I bought the vehicle. Honda states that there should be no troubles from RF. You might contact ARRL and see if that's still the case.

73, Tom N9CGD

Date: 11 May 93 12:37:58 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #563
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

RE: CUBA & QSLS DE SCOTT NF3I.

I HAVE QSL DIRECT WITH IRCS AND GREENSTAMPS ALONG WITH PRE-ADDRESSED ENVELOPES WITH NO LUCK. I ALSO HAVE TRIED GOING THROUGH THE BUREAU WITH NO LUCK. MY ONLY TWO SUCCESSES HAVE BEEN GOING THROUGH A QSL MANAGER (AMERICAN) EACH TIME. I HAVE ALSO NOTED THIS WITH OTHER COUNTRIES AS WELL. KEEP TRYING PERSISTENCE DOES PAY OFF.

GOOD DX DE KEN - K1JKR

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 21:12:30 GMT
From: haven.umd.edu!darwin.sura.net!knuth.mtsu.edu!raider!theporch!jackatak!bwm_ptg@ames.arpa
Subject: no-code defense
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

rnimtz@hilbert.helios.nd.edu (richard nimtz) writes:

```
> In article <930503.162837.6v1.rusnews.w165w@garlic.sbs.com> system@garlic.sbs
> >jherman@uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:
> >
> >> So, ladies and gentlemen, why don't we take an informal poll here on
> >> the net: give your callsign and state whether you support the no-code
> >> license or feel it was a bad idea. I'll start:
> >>
> >> I'm NH6IL and I'm against the no-code license.
> >
> > I'm KD1NR and I'm against the no-code license.
> >
> I'm N9??? (the license is in the mail) and for no-code.
```

I am KD4WYG/AA and I am for the no-code tech license

--

bwm_ptg@jackatak.raider.net (Bruce W. Martin)

-----jackatak.raider.net (615) 377-5980 -----

Date: 11 May 93 05:53:37 GMT

From: ddsww1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net

Subject: no-code defense

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C65wID.Lvn@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>system@garlic.sbs.com (Anthony S. Pelliccio) writes:

>: jim@n5ial.mythical.com (Jim Graham) writes:

>:

>: Well, there isn't too much bad with the no-code license. It's just when

>: they start screaming for extra priveledges on HF etc that it gets me a

> Why is it OK for them to try to get priveledges on VHF but not on HF? After

How about international law, one of those little items you were supposed to learn about to be granted a ham license?

>all it wasn't that long ago that no-code meant no license. Why do you draw a
>line at HF? It sounds to me like "I had to so should you." If that is the
>standard you wish to apply lets not give anybody civil rights either, unless
>they can recite the Constitution (I had to in school).

Learn to recite some important parts of communications law instead. It's your duty as a ham.

>I don't see how a code requirement advance any of the principles of our service.
> One of the purposes of the amateur radio service is to create a reserve of
>trained electronics techs. I think you could make a case for more stringent
>tech. requirements.: little bit bent out of shape. As for the opposition to the
no-code

1: WRONG-0. 2: RIGHT-0. One of the purposes of the ARS is to create a reserve of trained RADIO COMMUNICATIONS TECHNICIANS. The electronics tests were MUCH more stringent in 1967, and my father passed the tests knowing next to nothing about electronics; the tests today are a joke. In Chicago, I can hardly turn on the 2-meter rig on any day without hearing a chat between a pair talking about how the destination ham is going to solder a coaxial connector onto some coax for the driving ham. It's not at all unusual to hear questions about electronics on the air which are so simple, and indicative of absolutely no electronics knowledge, that they would make a second-WEEK electronics 101 student laugh. It's not at all unusual to hear

people operating FM voice on 144.01 simplex (do you know the TWO reasons that's illegal?), or in the satellite bands or over a beacon.

Let's try a scenario. The "big one" his Los Angeles. No power, no repeaters, most equipment is junk, no transportation, no phones, no communications. While you're still trying to figure out how to modulate a carrier, I'll be on the air, with a LEGAL transmitter in a LEGAL ham band, communicating with the outside world, because I can design, build and power a CW transmitter/receiver... and I can use CW.

>: license, well... if you look at QST roughly 10 years ago there's a

>: violent no-code stance in it.

> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

>Do you mean a violent anti-no-code or pro-no-code stance?

>Sorry I didn't keep up on QST until I became a ham in '91. If you mean

>anti-no-code then I guess we can all grow and change with the times.

>Growing should never stop.

The ham world was violently against having a no-code license of ANY kind. By that time, the tests were so simple that the only thing anyone really had to work at to get a license was CW; some thought of that as an exclusion for CB junkies effortlessly easing their way into our midst. Still others had been through situations where CW was the only way they could communicate with others at one point or another and realized the value of knowing CW. Yet more others realized that, to talk to people in poorer countries where ham gear is/was frequently homebrew junk that could only operate CW, we couldn't fulfill one of our mandates (that of enhancing international relations with people of different countries) without being able to talk CW with them, or at least understand what they were sending. And finally, most all hams knew back then that it was (and still is) international law that amateurs licensed to operate below 30 MHz had to demonstrate proficiency in the Morse code.

Wait... let me think. Getting more Cbers into the ham bands... not being able to communicate under certain circumstances... degrading international relations through removing a form of communications with hams in other nations... violating international law... yes, that IS growth. Sorry I carried on so. I take it all back.

> One of our others duties is to train pro. quality COMMUNICATORS.

"Other" duties? (See above.)

>We don't need a morse code proficiency test to keep the ham bands from turning
>into a mess like we see on CB. What we need to prevent that are a bunch of

No, we have that fantastically difficult technical test to pass.

>amateurs that care enough to help others out and show them what being a good
>operator is all about. But looking at the mess ours bands are already in I guess

>that is not very likely to happen. In my brief time as an amateur I have

Part of the reason the bands are in the shape they're in now is the long history of relaxing the requirements to get a license, or to upgrade to a higher class (and thus more privileges).

If you're convinced that being helpful and showing others what good operating techniques are will improve things as the licenses become available for two Cocoa Krispies boxtops, try your theory out on CB channel 9 for a bit.

>elmered four new no-codes into amateur radio. (my girlfriend is number 4 and >her license should be in Thursday's mail) They all know how to *operate* their >radios. They all help keep our local spectrum from looking like CB. They have >all participated in public service events, (my girlfriends first will be May >15th) they can all make a dipole and none of them whine.

Now THAT is something constructive. Keep that up and prove people like me wrong.

> I would rather hear a bunch of appliance operators who are coureous and >put out clean signals than some idiot who splatters all over the band and >care where he/she tunes up, tries to throw people off 'their' frequency because >'I always have a sked here' It is always the courteous operator, or usenet user >that get listened to, not just the one who is heard most loudly.

Oh, I see you heard about CB channel 9, eh? Must not have listened, though, because 5 minutes is all it takes to show that the one heard most loudly (usually screaming "Walk walk walk on you" or something about excretory functions) always overcomes the courteous, clean-signaled one.

I reiterate; there's little to keep that loud, splattering lout off the ham bands any more. When enough of them find that out, courteous operating techniques and good example ain't gonna help. Try this simple quiz:

The easier the test for a driver's license gets, the worse the drivers on the road get and the more bad drivers get on the road.

The easier it is to pass through grade school, the lower the SAT scores and the achievement scores of the students there.

The easier it is to get a ham license without knowing a thing about proper, multimodal communications, the _____ (better/worse) the class of people you find on the ham bands.

>And I was doing so well at staying out of this whole thread. ;-)

Something I'm going to strive to do in future myself.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp  |
|   WA9PDM     |      Use whichever one works                        |
+-----+
```


+-----+

Date: Mon, 10 May 1993 18:18:16 +0000
From: pipex!warwick!qmw-dcs!qmw!demon!wsbbs.demon.co.uk!df@uunet.uu.net
Subject: test msg
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi there

I wonder if someone would mind replying to this as I seem to have
problems getting msgs through to this troupe?

Thanks, 73 de Den G3VSH in Manchester, UK.

-- Sysop of the White Stick BBS (10pm-8am UTC) +44 61 864 1152

Date: 11 May 93 12:58:47 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: TS-850 General Coverage TX
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'd like to use my '850 with a 2-meter transverter @ 26-30 MHz.
Could someone point me to the general-coverage TX mod for the '850?

Thanks -

```
*****
Michael R. Owen, Ph.D.                                a.k.a.: W9IP
Department of Geology                                Northern Lights Software
St. Lawrence University                               Star Route, Box 60
Canton, NY 13617                                     Canton, NY 13617
(315) 379-5975 - voice -                             (315) 379-0161
MROWEN@STLAWU or MOWE@SLUMUS
*****
```

Date: Tue, 11 May 1993 04:39:58 GMT
From: nwnexus!ole!ssc!markz@uunet.uu.net
Subject: what is the issue here? (WAS: no-code defense)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Rev. Michael P. Deignan (kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com) wrote:

: 2. There is currently an NPRM in the works, being authored by Tony
: KD1NR, to restructure the [V,U]HF privileges of the no-code

: technician. Some of the ideas expressed in this discussion are
: going to be included as part of the NPRM.

Get your fact straight. You retrograde dweebs are working on a
Petition. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that revised the
Technician Class was the result of several petitions over several years.

One of those petitions was the result of a mailing list here on the
net. (And if you think this stinking little pile you've dropped in
this newsgroup is anything, you should have been here several years ago.)

Here's a quote out of the regulations (I'll leave it as an exercise
where it is. I've no intention of giving you any aid.)

" Petitions which are moot, premature, repetitive, frivolous, or which
plainly do not warrant consideration by the Commission may be denied
or dismissed without prejudice to the petitioner."
(Which, as I understand it, they'll ignore you, but not punish you
for wasting their time.)

So make sure your crayon is sharp, the folks in the Private Radio
Bureau will probably want to hang your great creation in their
bathroom.

Mark Zenier markz@ssc.wa.com markz@ssc.com

Date: 11 May 93 05:05:57 GMT
From: dds1!indep1!clifto@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.93Apr24165314@urth.eng.sun.com>,
<1993Apr25.140637.14242@anomaly.sbs.com>, <27APR199306472589@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov>
Subject : Re: no-code defense

In article <27APR199306472589@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov> stocker@nssdca.gsfc.nasa.gov
(ERICH FRANZ STOCKER) writes:

>

>1) theory is easy for some people and not for others. The reasons are varied
>and no clear cut answers exist. I once read that theory particularly the
>math and physics end are a natural for "left brained people" those whose
>tendency is to Logic based reasoning.

In 1966, when my father got his Technician license, the test was MUCH
harder than anything they've got today. For example, there were at least
five questions showing an untitled schematic and asking "What would happen
if resistor R5 opened?" or "What if C2 became leaky?"

My father didn't know Ohm's law from Murphy's law, literally. He had no idea how to measure current and couldn't even remember $E=IR$. The total extent of his electronics knowledge was his ability to change light bulbs and bang the TV when it went on the fritz. But he passed after a few months of diligent study, on his first try. Same with his General class some months later (after he got the code speed up).

When incentive licensing came into the picture circa 1967, he decided on a whim to stop while he was near the FCC office and take the Advanced class exam, figuring if nothing else he'd have spent four bux and he'd have an idea what the test was like. He came home laughing at how incredibly simplistic the test was. He passed it without any preparation.

>2) code is easy for some people and not for others. The reasons are varied and
>no clear cut answers exist for the difference. In the same article it pointed
>out that "right brained" people have an easier time with things like code.
>These people are the ones whose reasoning is dominated by the emotion side and
>tend to creativity.

I fought the code, alone, for a year. For that year I had no help of any kind; the only machine-assisted method available was a monstrous, paper-tape-operated ugly beast (can't remember the name, the Something-o-graph) which I couldn't afford to rent. I finally got it up to the 5 WPM for Novice but still couldn't find anyone to give me the test. Eventually, I heard that Allied Radio was giving classes and persuaded my father to drive me down to take the classes so I could take the test there. I HATED the code. It most certainly did NOT come easy. But I wanted to become a ham badly enough that I forced myself to learn it.

Then I spent another year of at least three hours per day, listening to code on a shortwave receiver, getting my speed up to pass the General. That was bloody murder and extremely discouraging for the first six months. But I did it.

And every four years, at renewal time, I had to sign my name to a form certifying that I could still copy that code speed. And I could.

My father rented the whatever-o-graph, which sent terrible, choppy code. He fought as hard as I had to learn the code and get his speed up. And he did it, six months from 0 to 5 WPM, seven more from 5 to 13.

>For 6 months, I have been studying the morse code. I work at least 1 hour
>per day in 30 min sessions. I have the ARRL tapes, some other company tapes,
>morse by rythmn and self hypnosis tapes. I also attend a class that is also
>allowing me to practice a little. In addition, I have Morse academy and
>supermorse and one other morse program which name I forgot. The best I
>am consistently taking is 3wpm. Randomly I can on occasion get 5wpm.

At least you're trying. Thank goodness _someone_ is.

>I took 2 weeks to study the novice and technician written test. I practiced
>with a computer test program and studied an additional week to ensure that

>I understood every answer. Checking the handbook and my electronics texts
>for anything I missed or was not sure of. I passed the tests easily without
>any misses. I already can pass both the general and advanced written tests.
>Haven't done it because I still can't pass the 5wpm code.

It took me about four years of studying magazines I couldn't understand to learn the electronics, because I couldn't find any books to learn from. Near the end of those four years I found a book I could at least learn the regulations from. There were no test pools back then; whatever questions you happened to find on one of the (how many were there?) different test booklets, you had to answer from innate knowledge. If you failed, you had to wait 30 days before re-testing.

>I am continuing to plug at the code. I think within the next month or so I
>may consistently get 5wpm. Then I'll take the 1A test and the general written
>test. Then I will work the rest of the year to try to get 13wpm.

>

>So, don't tell me how easy it is to learn the code and that some people you
>know did it after studying a couple of minutes. Great for those people! I'm

You'll _certainly_ never hear that from _me_!

>happy for them. However, there are other avenues into the Ham hobby and the
>Amateur SS ought not be determining who and how REAL people should be allowed
>in the hobby.

I guess you haven't read the part yet that says that Amateur Radio is supposed to be self-policing. Whether you mean Schutzstapfel [sp?] or Secret Service by that crack, your statement seems to take the exact opposite view, or at least suggests that you don't want ANY policing.

It has been only through the diligent self-policing efforts of other hams (such as refusing to talk to unlicensed people, tracking down repeater jammers, the ARRL's Official Observers, etc.) that ham radio has not been degraded to the level of CB. It is my observation that the easier the tests have become (they're absolutely laughable now), the worse the bands have gotten. If you want to see a radio service which formerly had requirements for licensing, detailed operating rules, etc., which has deteriorated over the years through relaxation of the rules and eventual removal of the licensing requirement, tune in channel 9 and have lots of fun with the echo-box jammers.

>I'm now a ham (as soon as the FCC does its part) and proud of it. I intend
>to upgrade as soon as I can get past the code obstacle. It isn't easy but it

It certainly IS worth it. But remember, it's what YOU make of it.

>is worth it. Although I question incentive licensing when it makes some
>people think that they are superior to others.

Incentive licensing has been under ridicule since its inception, and has done little for ham radio except to establish class castes and cliques of holier-than-thou, my-license-is-better-than-yours folk. Before that, the Extra Class was a real mark of distinction, as those who took both that test and the 1st Class Radiotelephone (Commercial) Operator's license test said that the Extra was much more difficult to pass. (Still, most who took it still did so out of a sort of snob appeal, since General class was as high as you needed to go to get all Amateur privileges.) I only took the Advanced test to stop my father's incessant nagging; to me, it wasn't worth the 20-minute trip downtown. It was my perception that only the ARRL wanted incentive licensing introduced, and still is.

Keep the faith, keep on plugging, you'll get there and you'll feel like you've accomplished something more than popping into a Radio Shack and buying a CB and a mag-mounted rubber duck.

--

```
+-----+
|  Cliff Sharp  |      clifto@indep1.chi.il.us   OR  clifto@indep1.uucp   |
|   WA9PDM     |                        Use whichever one works          |
+-----+
```

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #566
